

REMARKS

Claims 35-68 are pending in the present application. Claims 35 and 68 have been amended in this response. Support for the amendments may be found, for example, in paragraph [0034]. No new matter has been introduced as a result of the amendments. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claim 35 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, for using the term “a reduced SAR value.” While Applicants maintain that this term particularly points out and distinctly claims the recited subject matter, the term has been deleted from the claims to further prosecution of the application. Withdrawal of the rejection is earnestly requested.

Claims 35-43, 47, 50, 52-53 and 66-68 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by *Phillips et al.* (US Patent 6,421,016).

Claims 35 and 44-45 were also rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by *Perrotta et al.* (US Patent 6,246,374).

Claims 37, 46 and 54-65 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Phillips et al.* (US Patent 6,421,016) in view of *Perrotta et al.* (US Patent 6,246,374).

Claim 48 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Phillips et al.* (US Patent 6,421,016) in view of *Ying et al.* (US Patent 6,650,294).

Claim 49 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Phillips et al.* (US Patent 6,421,016) in view of *Perrotta et al.* (US Patent 6,246,374), and further in view of *Ying et al.* (US Patent 6,650,294).

Claim 51 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Phillips et al.* (US Patent 6,421,016) in view of *Pirila et al.* (US Patent 6,728,555) and *Perrotta et al.* (US Patent 6,246,374). The Applicants traverse the above rejections for the following reasons.

Specifically, the cited art, alone or in combination, fails to teach or suggest “at least one first additional, current-conducting corrective element for SAR value reduction coupled to the circuit board, wherein the first corrective element increases the total current level directly from the circuit board, and wherein the first corrective element is embodied such that at least one of an amplitude level and a phase angle of electrical currents on the antenna, the circuit board, and the corrective element, are adjusted in relation to each other, such that a maximum SAR distribution which results overall as a result of electrical currents in body tissue of a user becomes minimal”

as recited in claim 35, an similarly recited in claim 68. Under the recited configuration, the at least one additional current-conducting corrective element is linked to the circuit board and embodied in such a way that the electrical current which comes to flow on it is adapted with regard to its amplitude level and/or phase angle to the electrical currents at the antenna and the circuit board such that overall, these currents result in an SAR field with a minimized maximum. Accordingly, "hot spots" can be avoided in a device.

Regarding Phillips, the reference deals with reducing SAR effects, but relies on a materially different configuration. Phillips discloses that the first conductor 104 diverts current by presenting a low impedance to RF currents and thus attracts them onto itself (col. 3, lines 54-56). In FIGs. 1-3, Phillips shows that the first conductor is located near an upper, rear side of a housing 106 of the device 100 opposite from a front surface 112. Accordingly, the first conductor would be substantially distant from a user's head placed near the front of the device and the users hand which will cover the bottom of the back of the device (col. 3, lines 59-63). However, the first conductor is integrated with a second conductor 108 which directly contacts the surface of the circuit board (FIG. 1). The second conductor 108 is disclosed as presenting a high impedance to RF currents and is used to divert currents away from itself and any dissipating media located proximally thereto (col. 4, lines 9-12; see claim 1).

Thus, the arrangement in Phillips fails to teach or suggest that the first corrective element *increases the total current level directly from the circuit board*. The first conductor in Phillips (104) is not arranged in increase total current levels directly from the circuit board, and the second conductor (108) is clearly configured to decrease the total current level (col. 5, lines 14-22)

Regarding Perrotta, the reference teaches a parasitic element (18) that operates as a passive radiator element to radiate along with the main antenna (16) to enhance the gain of the antenna system (see Abstract). Perrotta discloses that the parasitic element and antenna are not physically connected by a common feed point, but are magnetically coupled in parallel to allow the two elements to radiate in a complimentary fashion (col. 2, lines 15-20, 37-43; col. 3, lines 27-29, 38-39; see claim 5). However, Perrota also fails to disclose that the first corrective element increases the total current level directly from the circuit board, and also fails to address SAR distribution. Perrota discloses that the parasitic radiator operates to divert current from

speaker wires or other audio lines *from entering the circuit board* (col. 3, lines 3-8). This arrangement is done to reduce proximity effects that may distort transmissions when a user's hand interferes with the antenna's radiating area (col. 3, lines 8-14).

In light of the present amendments, Applicants respectfully submit the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102 have been overcome. Withdrawal of the rejections is earnestly requested. As Applicants have demonstrated the allowability of independent claims 35 and 68, withdrawal of the remaining rejections including those under 35 U.S.C. §103 are also requested.

In light of the above, the Applicants respectfully submit that claims 35-68 are both novel and non-obvious over the art of record. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. If any additional fees are due in connection with this application as a whole, the Commissioner is authorized to deduct said fees from Deposit Account No.: 02-1818. If such a deduction is made, please indicate the attorney docket number (0117393-012) on the account statement.

Respectfully submitted,

BELL, BOYD & LLOYD LLC

BY 

Peter Zura
Reg. No. 48,196
Customer No.: 29177
Phone: (312) 807-4208

Dated: June 18, 2007